

has defended this deal by challenging critics who put forward alternatives. How about this? How about exercising American leadership and making it clear that crippling sanctions will be maintained and strengthened if Iran nuclear activity continues? Congress should reject this bad deal. We then can enact more vigorous sanctions to persuade the Iranian leaders to reconsider their position or persuade the Iranian people to reconsider their leaders.

Mr. President, I apologize for going over my time. I yield the floor to my colleague from North Carolina, and I see my colleague from Maine is waiting to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I have come to talk about what I think we have reached here—a tipping point in terms of President Obama's legacy.

Recently, Jimmy Carter emphatically charged that President Obama has weakened us and brought us less respect everywhere in the world. When President Carter makes a statement such as that, I don't think President Obama should be spiking the football in the Rose Garden.

Why do you think President Carter made those statements? Maybe he has looked at the legacy over the last 6 years, as many of the American people have. Ukraine is on fire. China is threatening its neighbors. Al Qaeda is stronger than ever. ISIS is massacring Christians and Muslims with genocidal savagery the likes of which we haven't seen since the Second World War. The Jewish people are facing the greatest threat since the Holocaust.

The President got this deal with the ayatollahs, no matter how dangerous and no matter how destabilizing the final accord is. He has claimed a victory, and the media vanguards are right behind him, and he is going to late-night comedy cable shows to build his case.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is no laughing matter. You are going to hear a lot of speeches over the next few weeks—in the 60 days we have to review this deal. There are going to be a lot of technical terms, a lot of things that quite honestly some Members of Congress don't fully understand. But I hope that over the next 60 days we will be able to communicate to the American people in a way that they understand why this is a very dangerous deal.

Here are some questions I hope you will look into and form your own opinion.

One question: Is there truly a dismantlement of Iran's nuclear program? I have looked at the summary of the agreement. I have not read the full text yet. I will be doing that this week. But it is very clear this is not a matter of whether Iran can have a nuclear weapon; it is a matter of when they can have a nuclear weapon. That is not dismantlement; that is scheduling.

There is another one. I think my colleague from Indiana just spoke about

it. It has to do with inspections. We use terms like "snapback" and everything else, but let's put this in very simple terms. Imagine that the police in your community suspected there was a criminal enterprise in some house. Imagine that instead of being able to get a warrant and then quickly go and knock on the door and identify that criminal activity, the police would send a letter to the criminal saying: In the next 4 or 5 weeks, 3 or 4 weeks, we are going to do a surprise inspection on your house. What is the likelihood that criminal presence or that criminal activity is going to be there? That is the nature of the inspections regime with the nation that still continues to chant "Death to America." They are not a good player. They are not a good actor. Giving them time to prepare for a so-called snap inspection makes no sense to me, but that is what is in this deal, and it is written out in plain English.

Another question is this: Why hasn't the President done something as basic as have the Iranian people—or the Iranian leadership, I should say; this is not about the people, it is about the leadership—show good faith by releasing American prisoners in Iran?

As far as the ballistic missile program, ask the President, ask the people who negotiated this agreement: Will Iran have a ballistic missile program? The answer is yes. They actually have backorders for missiles that could reach Europe. Over time, they will develop a program that will reach the United States. This agreement has no treatment for this.

Ask them if they will dismantle the Iran terror network. The Iran terror network operates throughout the world. The Iran terror network is funded literally through the Government of Iran. Over \$300 million has been identified by Canadian intelligence agencies as having been funneled to terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and a number of others. Are they going to dismantle it? No. As a matter of fact, I believe that with the sanctions being removed, it is going to provide them more money to fund those networks.

Why would the President release \$140 billion in sanctions? Why would we do that? Why would we provide money to a nation that says they need money but they can spend money on terror and a number of other things—not education, not fixing roads, not better health care for Iranians, but spreading terror throughout the world? Why on Earth would we give them more money to do that?

The President has given birth to the Middle East nuclear arms race as well. Ask yourself this question: Do you think it is likely that Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Egypt, and other Gulf States are going to stand idly by when a hostile regime is going to have a nuclear capability over some period of time? Of course not. They are going to do what they need to do to feel like they are protecting their citizens. It will give

rise to an arms race. We will be taking about this if this deal goes through I think in my tenure as a Senator over the next 5 years.

President Obama has willfully ignored 40 years of hostility from Tehran. The President may not recognize that we are at war, but the Iranians certainly do. They say in public statements that they are going to continue their fight against America. They are a chief sponsor of global terror. They have never stepped back from their desire to obliterate the United States and our great friend and ally Israel.

This is the Obama doctrine. The President sees America as the problem. He views Israel as an obstacle to peace and Iran as another oppressed constituency with legitimate grievances against the West. In fact, so much so, when millions of Iranians took to the streets to protest the mullahs—the leaders of Iran—the President was silent. The old American alliances are collapsing in confusion and fear, and the only answer from the administration seems to be a clear path toward Iran possessing a nuclear weapon.

In his 1987 State of the Union Address, President Ronald Reagan warned:

Our approach is not to seek agreement for agreement's sake but to settle only for agreements that truly enhance our national security and that of our allies. We will never put our security at risk or that of our allies just to reach an agreement. . . . No agreement is better than a bad agreement.

So there you have it. Our allies—Israel, Saudi Arabia, the Gulf States, Jordan, Egypt—are worried. Tehran is on the march and moving closer to a nuclear weapon. Charles Krauthammer noted, "The one great hope for Middle East peace, the strategic anchor for 40 years [the United States] is giving the green light to terror." Ladies and gentlemen, I don't think that is a legacy anyone should be proud of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUL-LIVAN). The Senator from Maine.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1828 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

WOMEN VETERANS AND FAMILIES HEALTH SERVICES ACT OF 2015

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am on the floor today to discuss the path forward on my bill, the Women Veterans and Families Health Services Act of 2015. This is legislation which would end VA's decades-old ban on fertility services, and it would take critical steps toward ensuring that we are doing everything we can to support veterans who have sacrificed so much for our country and have suffered injuries on the battlefield that prevent them from having children on their own.

I introduced this legislation because I believe strongly that our commitment to servicemembers doesn't stop at the end of their tours. I believe that commitment doesn't stop at all, ever. And a critical part of this commitment—of what our country should do to make sure those who sacrificed so much for us can live the lives they hoped for—is helping seriously wounded veterans start families so that those who put their lives on hold and on the line have the opportunity to achieve that important goal.

Caring for our veterans should never be a partisan issue, and helping our wounded warriors start families should rise above the petty political fights we see too often in Washington, DC. So I was very proud to work with Republicans on the Veterans' Affairs Committee on a bipartisan compromise, one that should have allowed my veterans health care act to pass through the committee today with strong bipartisan support, as it has in the past. And until yesterday, that was exactly what I thought was going to happen. My bill was on the agenda. It was going to come up for a vote, and I thought it was going to pass. That is why I am so disappointed and truly angry that Republicans on the Veterans' Affairs Committee decided yesterday to leap at the opportunity to pander to their base, to poison the well with the political cable news battle of the day and turn their backs on these wounded veterans.

Just a few Republicans with just a few poison-pill amendments have turned our bipartisan effort to help wounded veterans into a partisan effort to attack women's health care. I find that shameful. That is why, after it became clear that there was not a path to getting those political amendments withdrawn today, I spoke with Chairman ISAKSON and I asked him to pull the bill from the markup rather than see it become a vehicle for partisan, political attacks.

I know some Republicans are trying to use this latest issue as just one more opportunity to roll back the clock and take away women's health care options. We can have that fight. We have had it many times before. But we should not be putting veterans in the middle of it. Don't take something that should be above politics—our sacred duty to our veterans—and pull it down into the muck of petty politics. It is not fair to these veterans and it is not fair to their families, who have been hoping and praying for the opportunity to have children. It is not fair to the veterans and servicemembers, who don't want to see their health care become just one more political football. And it is certainly not fair to our constituents, who send us to Congress expecting us to stand together and support those who sacrificed so much for all of us.

I am going to keep fighting for them and for this effort. I am not going to let those who put politics ahead of vet-

erans and servicemembers get their way.

I truly do hope Republicans reconsider this absolutely shameful approach today and work with us to get this bill done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I join my extraordinarily dedicated and distinguished colleague from Washington State in expressing my regret that this bill will not be on our agenda today, and I thank her for championing a cause that matters so vitally to our military men and women, which is the cause of fairness to our veterans and putting our veterans above politics.

The bill she has advocated steadfastly and so eloquently provides services to wounded women warriors who want to have children and cannot do so because of those wounds of war. It makes available to them modern medicine, just as we are trying to do in other areas where the signature wounds of war inflict such damage on our wounded warriors. They deserve the right to treatment that enables them to have families, enables them to overcome those wounds of war that interfere with their ability to have children.

That is important not only to them but to their families, to their husbands. Many of their husbands are themselves veterans. This issue has ramifications way beyond the individuals involved. It is a matter of putting our veterans above politics, which traditionally has been our practice on the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

I am very proud to serve as the ranking member of that committee, to have worked with Senator MURRAY in her tireless efforts on this bill going back years. She has been rightly recognized for those efforts. Today I very much regret the tradition of our committee—putting veterans above politics—has succumbed to this threat; that the bill offered by Senator MURRAY will become mired down in issues that have nothing to do with providing IVF services to our wounded women warriors.

The amendments that have been offered are completely irrelevant and extraneous to the objectives of the bill. Make no mistake, they have nothing to do with protecting women, they have nothing to do with enabling our women veterans to have children and overcome those wounds of war. They are completely irrelevant, indeed contrary to the objectives of that bill. Yet they will now cause this bill to be removed from the agenda.

I just want to say to my colleague and fellow member of that committee that I am absolutely determined to find a path forward for this bill. It will be a priority of mine personally. I know it is a priority of the Senator from Washington, and I will join her in ensuring that our colleagues know we are determined to move forward, to find a path to pass this measure, and to

make sure our women veterans are recognized for the heroes they are.

These amendments are a disservice to them. Very simply, they are disrespectful to the women who sacrificed so much, who have suffered the same wounds as our men, and who receive less respect by virtue of this bill being withdrawn. I am hopeful we can work with Senator ISAKSON, chairman of the committee, to find that path forward. He has been very bipartisan in his approach, and I thank him for his efforts in that respect.

I will redouble my efforts to make sure we keep faith with our women veterans, enabling them to overcome those injuries that prevent them from having children and giving up the benefit of their being such great parents and giving our Nation great children, which is our obligation on this committee, in this body, and in this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DRIVE ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in a moment I am going to be going over and concentrating on some of the things that are in this bill, just concentrating on bridges, something people are not as aware of as they should be. Now what I am talking about is that sometime today we are going to be repeating the vote that we had yesterday, except this time we should be able to get it adopted.

I don't criticize any of the Democrats who voted against the motion to proceed to the highway bill yesterday because they did not get information in a timely fashion. It was our fault that they did not get the information until about 30 minutes before the vote. I understand that. Now they have had 24 hours to look it over. I think they will be pleased to support the long-term highway bill. So I was not one who complained about that.

That vote will take place today. That is to get us to the bill, so we can start on amendments. I am going to ask as many of our Members to bring down amendments, if they have amendments, so we can get them in the queue to discuss. There are three committees involved. The very largest piece of the bill is the Environment and Public Works Committee, which is the committee that I chair.

When I say the vast majority of that, what I am talking about is 80 percent of the bill. So that has been available for inspection by the public, by the Democrats, the Republicans, by all of the Members ever since June 24. June